

Azerbaijan Public Financial Management Profile



Introduction

This note presents a series of charts which provide an **overview** of Azerbaijan's recent public financial management (PFM) performance based on this country's 2014 Public Expenditure and Financial Accountability (PEFA) assessment. Comparisons are made between Azerbaijan's performance and the performance of the other twenty-three countries that had PEFA assessments published in 2014-2015. All analyses have been prepared using results reported from using the 2011 PEFA methodology.

Overall PFM performance

Individual country PFM performance has been determined by applying the following points scale to reported individual performance indicator (PI) scores as presented in Table 1. No points were allocated to PIs that were not scored because

either data was unavailable, a D score was given or the PI was not applicable.

Table 1: PI scoring methodology

| PEFA PI score | Points allocated |
|---------------|------------------|
| A | 3 |
| B+ | 2.5 |
| B | 2 |
| C+ | 1.5 |
| C | 1 |
| D+ | .5 |
| D | 0 |

The graph in Figure 1 below shows Azerbaijan's overall score was ranked second out of the twenty-four countries.

Figure 1: Aggregate PEFA scores for 24 countries



Download a png version of Figure 1 [here](#) (Azerbaijan overall result) to review the overall scores of Azerbaijan and the twenty-three other countries in more detail.

Details of the distribution of overall country scores across PFM performance categories, as determined by PFMConnect, are

presented in Table 2. Azerbaijan’s overall score was 61.5 points.

Table 2: Distribution of country PFM performance levels

| PFM performance | Overall Scores | Number of countries |
|-----------------|----------------|---------------------|
| Very strong | 66.37-84 | 0 |
| Strong | 49.57-66.36 | 8 |
| Moderate | 32.77-49.56 | 7 |
| Weak | 15.97-32.76 | 8 |
| Very weak | 0-15.96 | 1 |
| Total | | 24 |

Azerbaijan’s overall PFM performance is classified as “strong”.

PI performance

The graph in Figure 2 below shows the scores for Azerbaijan individual PIs compared with the average score recorded for each PI across the twenty-four PEFA assessments we have studied. Please note that no score was recorded for the top indicator in Figure 2 as this indicator (PI-8) was not assessed.

Figure 2: Azerbaijan PI score comparisons



Download a pdf version of Figure 2 [here](#) (Azerbaijan PIs) to review individual PI scores in more detail.

Twenty-seven PIs were assessed. Twenty-one PIs had scores above the country average whilst six PIs had scores below the country average.

Performance across key PFM activities

The graph in Figure 3 below shows the average scores for the six key PFM activities compared with the average score recorded for these activities across the twenty-four country PEFA assessments we have studied.

Figure 3: Azerbaijan key PFM activity comparisons



All six key PFM activities recorded scores below the country average. Download a png version of Figure 3 [here](#) (Azerbaijan key PFM activities) to review these scores in more detail.

PEFA ASSESSMENT

You can download the 2014 PEFA assessment for Azerbaijan [here](#).

[Download pdf](#)

Antigua & Barbuda Public Financial Management Profile



Introduction

This note presents a series of charts which provide an **overview** of Antigua and Barbuda's recent public financial management (PFM) performance based on this country's 2014 Public Expenditure and Financial Accountability (PEFA) assessment. Comparisons are made between Antigua and Barbuda's performance and the performance of the other twenty-three countries that had PEFA assessments published in 2014-2015. All analyses have been prepared using results reported from using the 2011 PEFA methodology.

Overall PFM performance

Individual country PFM performance has been determined by applying the following points scale to reported individual performance indicator (PI) scores as presented in Table 1. No points were allocated to PIs that were not scored because


either data was unavailable, a D score was given or the PI was not applicable.

Table 1: PI scoring methodology

| PEFA PI score | Points allocated |
|---------------|------------------|
| A | 3 |
| B+ | 2.5 |
| B | 2 |
| C+ | 1.5 |
| C | 1 |
| D+ | .5 |
| D | 0 |

The graph in Figure 1 below shows Antigua and Barbuda’s overall score was ranked 23rd out of the twenty-four countries.

Figure 1: Aggregate PEFA scores for 24 countries



Details of the distribution of overall country scores across PFM performance categories, as determined by PFMConnect, are presented in Table 2. Antigua and Barbuda’s overall score was 17 points.

Table 2: Distribution of country PFM performance levels


| PFM performance | Overall Scores | Number of countries |
|-----------------|----------------|---------------------|
| Very strong | 66.37-84 | 0 |
| Strong | 49.57-66.36 | 8 |
| Moderate | 32.77-49.56 | 7 |
| Weak | 15.97-32.76 | 8 |
| Very weak | 0-15.96 | 1 |
| Total | | 24 |

Antigua and Barbuda’s overall PFM performance is classified as “weak”.

PI performance

The graph in Figure 2 below shows the scores for Antigua and Barbuda’s individual PIs compared with the average score recorded for each PI across the twenty-four PEFA assessments we have studied. Please note that no scores were recorded for the top nine indicators in Figure 2 as one indicator was not assessed (PI-15) and the other eight indicators (PI-3, PI-10, PI-16, PI-19, PI-21, PI-22, PI-23 and PI-28) were given D scores in the PEFA assessment.

Figure 2: Antigua and Barbuda PI score comparisons




Download a pdf version of Figure 2 [here](#) (Antigua and Barbuda PIs) to review individual PI scores in more detail.

Twenty-seven PIs were assessed. One PI had a score equal to the country average whilst twenty-six PIs had scores below the country average.

Performance across key PFM activities

The graph in Figure 3 below shows the average scores for the six key PFM activities compared with the average score recorded for these activities across the twenty-four country PEFA assessments we have studied.

Figure 3: Antigua and Barbuda key PFM activity comparisons



All six key PFM activities recorded scores below the country average.

PEFA ASSESSMENT

You can download the 2014 PEFA assessment for Antigua and Barbuda [here](#).

Greenland Public Financial Management Profile



Introduction

This note presents a series of charts which provide an **overview** of Greenland's recent public financial management (PFM) performance based on this country's 2014 Public Expenditure and Financial Accountability (PEFA) assessment. Comparisons are made between Greenland's performance and the performance of the other twenty-three countries that had PEFA assessments published in 2014-2015. All analyses have been prepared using results reported from using the 2011 PEFA methodology.

Overall PFM performance

Individual country PFM performance has been determined by applying the following points scale to reported individual performance indicator (PI) scores as presented in Table 1. No points were allocated to PIs that were not scored because

either data was unavailable, a D score was given or the PI was not applicable.

Table 1: PI scoring methodology

| PEFA PI score | Points allocated |
|---------------|------------------|
| A | 3 |
| B+ | 2.5 |
| B | 2 |
| C+ | 1.5 |
| C | 1 |
| D+ | .5 |
| D | 0 |

The graph in Figure 1 below shows Greenland's overall score was ranked 1st out of the twenty-four countries.

Figure 1: Aggregate PEFA scores for 24 countries



Details of the distribution of overall country scores across PFM performance categories, as determined by PFMConnect, are presented in Table 2. Greenland's overall score was 64.5 points.

Table 2: Distribution of country PFM performance levels


| PFM performance | Overall Scores | Number of countries |
|------------------------|-----------------------|----------------------------|
| Very strong | 66.37-84 | 0 |
| Strong | 49.57-66.36 | 8 |
| Moderate | 32.77-49.56 | 7 |
| Weak | 15.97-32.76 | 8 |
| Very weak | 0-15.96 | 1 |
| Total | | 24 |

Greenland’s overall PFM performance is classified as “strong”.

PI performance

The graph in Figure 2 below shows the scores for Greenland’s individual PIs compared with the average score recorded for each PI across the twenty-four PEFA assessments we have studied. Please note that no scores were recorded for the top two indicators in Figure 2 as one indicator was not assessed (PI-15) and the other indicator (PI-23) was given a D score in the PEFA assessment.

Figure 2: Greenland PI score comparisons




Download a pdf version of Figure 2 here ([Greenland PIs](#)) to review individual PI scores in more detail.

Twenty-seven PIs were assessed. Twenty-four PIs had scores above the country average, one PI had a score equal to the country average whilst two PIs had scores below the country average.

Performance across key PFM activities

The graph in Figure 3 below shows the average scores for the six key PFM activities compared with the average score recorded for these activities across the twenty-four country PEFA assessments we have studied.

Figure 3: Greenland key PFM activity comparisons



All six key PFM activities recorded scores above the country average.

PEFA ASSESSMENT

You can download the 2014 PEFA assessment for Greenland [here](#).

Mongolia Public Financial Management Profile



Introduction

This note presents a series of charts which provide an **overview** of Mongolia's recent public financial management (PFM) performance based on this country's 2015 Public Expenditure and Financial Accountability (PEFA) assessment. Comparisons are made between Mongolia's performance and the performance of the other twenty-three countries that had PEFA assessments published in 2014-2015. All analyses have been prepared using results reported from using the 2011 PEFA methodology.

Overall PFM performance

Individual country PFM performance has been determined by applying the following points scale to reported individual performance indicator (PI) scores as presented in Table 1. No points were allocated to PIs that were not scored because either data was unavailable, a D score was given or the PI was not applicable.

Table 1: PI scoring methodology

| PEFA PI score | Points allocated |
|---------------|------------------|
| A | 3 |
| B+ | 2.5 |
| B | 2 |
| C+ | 1.5 |

| | |
|----|----|
| C | 1 |
| D+ | .5 |
| D | 0 |

The graph in Figure 1 below shows Mongolia's overall score was ranked 13th out of the twenty-four countries.

Figure 1: Aggregate PEFA scores for 24 countries



Details of the distribution of overall country scores across PFM performance categories, as determined by PFMConnect, are presented in Table 2. Mongolia's overall score was 50 points.

Table 2: Distribution of country PFM performance levels

| PFM performance | Overall Scores | Number of countries |
|-----------------|----------------|---------------------|
| Very strong | 66.37-84 | 0 |
| Strong | 49.57-66.36 | 8 |
| Moderate | 32.77-49.56 | 7 |
| Weak | 15.97-32.76 | 8 |
| Very weak | 0-15.96 | 1 |
| Total | | 24 |


Mongolia's overall PFM performance is classified as

“moderate”.

PI performance

The graph in Figure 2 below shows the scores for Mongolia’s individual PIs compared with the average score recorded for each PI across the twenty-four PEFA assessments we have studied. Please note that no scores were recorded for the top two indicators in Figure 2 as these indicators (PI-1 and PI-3) were given D scores in the PEFA assessment.

Figure 2: Mongolia PI score comparisons




Download a pdf version of Figure 2 here ([Mongolia PIs](#)) to review individual PI scores in more detail.

Twenty-eight PIs were assessed. Thirteen PIs had scores above the country average whilst fifteen PIs had scores below the country average.

Performance across key PFM activities

The graph in Figure 3 below shows the average scores for the six key PFM activities compared with the average score recorded for these activities across the twenty-four country PEFA assessments we have studied.

Figure 3: Mongolia key PFM activity comparisons



Four key PFM activities recorded scores above the country average whilst two activities recorded scores below the country average.

PEFA ASSESSMENT

You can download the 2015 PEFA assessment for Mongolia [here](#).